The State of Affairs Post 12/11/73

One notes a tendency on the part of the President to refer to himself in the third person when rebutting critics and mounting counterattacks to overcome the seemingly endless scandals of his administration. This appears to imply that an attack on him is by definition an attack on the office of Chief Executive; so for clarity let us once more review the state of affairs in the same abstract terms, without indulging in personalities.

The President is one who presides. The incumbent President has, knowingly or not, presided over what is probably the grossest and most highly organized perversion of the governmental process in the history of the republic. The sheer number of high officials, appointed by the Executive, who are now under criminal indictment or who have resigned from office under a cloud, is without precedent; their summary effect simply spells out the bankruptcy of this Executive operation.

Let's be clear on this: these were not people who infiltrated the White House, after all, in order to subvert the administration. The majority of them are skilled political professionals having years of acquaintance with the President, men whose ideas and methods meshed closely with his own, and whose confidence and trust he has proclaimed over and over again. They were chosen by him, not thrust upon him, and their motives and means must be construed as his own. Spies, burglars, saboteurs, blackmailers — these are ugly and degrading words to associate with the office of the presidency; and yet we can now assign names from the presidential team to each of these categories with dismaying certainty. Whether the President knew in detail of their activities is in the large sense irrelevant; he must answer for their acts as the ship's captain must answer for the behavior of his crew. Until this is satisfactorily done the Executive Branch will remain suspect as potentially capable of fostering more of the same type of illegal activities, with perhaps more dire result.

The nation does not have to risk this. The constitutional means for avoiding it are at hand, and should be pursued with vigor to the legal limit.

STUART G. HIBBEN.

Accokeek, Md.

Credibility of the Press

The Washington Post continues its tirade of abuse, inuendo and hatred against the President. In the October 28th issue there were five demeaning cartoons and twice that many editorials, columns, and biased news stories, all with one aim; namely, to discredit and bring down the President.

There was no word of praise from anybody about the excellent handling of the Mideast crisis which had been accomplished in the face of this storm of abuse.

Columnist Broder even lamented the fact that the President had a chance to refute his accusors on prime TV time. The TV commentators and the newspapers have prime time seven days a week and they use it with a vengeance. Thank God he did have a chance on TV to let the people see and judge for themselves.

The Post states that the President's popularity is at a low ebb. What you don't seem to realize is that the credibility of the press and TV commentators is at an even lower ebb. This is particularly true in your "source" stories where the source is, in many cases, in the reporter's own mind. Why shouldn't the press have to prove its own self started rumors?

What you don't seem to realize is that your long campaign of vilification is dividing the country. Your hatred printed day after day is bound to infect others on both sides with hatred, and this is the worst harm of all.

Why can't you realize that if you are interested in the welfare of the country, you should promote fairness, understanding and a love of your fellow man?

H. C. BUSH.

Alexandria.